DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 973 IR 001 655

AUTHOR	Schaefer, Donald George
TITLE	Attitudes of Music Catalogers Toward Major Problems of Cataloging Music Scores and Phonodiscs.
INSTITUTION	Brigham Young Univ., Provo, Utah. Graduate Dept. of Library and Information Sciences.
PUB DATE	8 Aug 74
NOTE	54p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Analysis of Variance; Attitudes; Attitude Tests; *Cataloging; College Libraries; *Librarians; Library Collections; Library Research; Library Surveys; Library Technical Processes; *Music; *Phonograph Records; *Problems; Questionnaires; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	Catalogers; *Musical Scores

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire was sent to 150 music score and/or phonodisc catalogers, selected at random from 367 libraries at universities or colleges affiliated with the National Association of Schools of Music. The survey was designed to gauge their attitudes toward the existence of problems in the cataloging of musical scores and phonodiscs; the rating of such problems as major; and the variances found among the catalogers relative to years of experience, college degrees held, and the size of their collections. The questionnaire consisted of 15 different categorical problem statements found in library literature. Responses came from 86 catalogers with masters degrees or better and 14 with bachelors degrees or less. Data were tested using the modified Amplified Doolittle Computer Program. Analysis of variance revealed that the significant problem areas were: obtaining analytics for anthologies, making uniform title entries, and creating subject headings. Responses varied significantly relative to collection size and years of experience for analytics, subject headings, and expansion of card catalogs. Responses also varied relative to subject headings and college degrees held. (Author/SL)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED102973

ATTITUDES OF MUSIC CATALOGERS TOWARD MAJOR PROBLEMS OF CATALOGING MUSIC SCORES AND PHONODISCS

A Research Paper

Submitted to The

Graduate Department of Library and Information Science

Brigham Young University

Provo, Utah

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements of

L. I. S. 697

by
Donald George Schaefer
August 8, 1974

IR 001655

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the positive attitudes of college music catalogers towards the existence of problems in cataloging music scores and phonodiscs. Items tested were: a) the existence of such problems, b) the rating of such problems as major, and c) the variances found among the catalogers relative to years experience, college degrees held and size of their collections.

A questionnaire was sent to 150 music score and/or phonodisc catalogers who were selected at random from 367 universities or colleges affiliated with the National Association of Schools of Music. The questions consisted of 15 different categorical problem statements found in the library literature. Catalogers with master's degrees or more, numbering 86, and catalogers with bachelor's degrees or less, numbering 14, responded to the survey. Data were tested using the Modified Amplified Doolittle Computer Program.

Analysis of variance revealed that the significant problem areas were a) obtaining analytics for anthologies b) making uniform title entries and c) creating subject headings. Responses varied significantly relative to collection size and years experience for analytics, subject headings and expansion of card catalogs. Responses also varied relative to subject headings and college degrees held.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the many people who aided in the completion of this costly "research paper". This study would not have been a success without the wonderful response he received from over one hundred and twenty music catalogers throughout the United States. Their dedication to professional librarianship, and especially music librarianship, strongly impressed him as the study developed.

Also, there are four special people whose efforts meant a great deal to the writer. Many thanks to Gerald Dick, Brigham Young University music cataloger, whose guidance directed the writer to an understanding of cataloging problems relative to music scores and phonodiscs. Thanks are also due to Master's Chairman in the Library Science School, Dr. Nathan M. Smith, who approved of the study and offered assistance when it was most needed. Likewise, thanks should be expressed to a very important person who counseled with the writer to set up the statistical aspects of the study, Dr. Leland Hendrix of the B.Y.U. Computer Center. And last but most important of all, the writer's dear wife, Georgia, who cared for the family while he was away on research and who also helped with the typing of the paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem
Definition of Terms
Delimitation
Hypotheses

II. LITERATURE SEARCH 6

Statements Prior to World War II
Statements During the 1950's
Statements During This Past Decade
Summary of Statements

III. DATA COLLECTION 14

Survey Plan
Collection Techniques
Analysis of Returns

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA 18

Preparation
Data Results

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .26

Problem Statement
Procedures
Summary of Findings
Conclusions
Recommendations

APPENDIX 1: MAJOR PROBLEMS OF CATALOGING MUSIC SCORES AND PHONODISCS SURVEY 31

APPENDIX 2: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES 1-20 34

Cell Sizes and Means Associated with the Analysis of Variance on Problems 1-15

Analysis of Variance on Problem Numbers 1-15

APPENDIX 3: RESPONSE CHART OF COMBINED RANKINGS ON THE FOURTH AND FIFTH DEGREES OF THE SURVEY . . .45

SOURCES CITED 47

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Music catalogers are often confronted with problems of music identification. These problems are not encountered in usual book cataloging. The complexities of music cataloging are ofttimes attributed to the acoustic and elusive nature of music itself. In order to meet the challenge of these problems of music, music catalogers have tried to define and classify them.

Music score and phonodisc cataloging problems, however, have not been clearly defined in the past by music catalogers. In the library literature the cataloging problems of these two media have been stated briefly in general terms. Usually these references were made in conjunction with books about music history or music theory.

Because music score cataloging and phonodisc cataloging cite the same subject material, their problems were interrelated. In most past instances this togetherness was not shown in the library literature. Usually phonodiscs received a little more attention than music scores. Yet they have never been studied together in depth.

The question then arose: since music score cataloging problems and phonodisc cataloging problems involved the same

difficulties, can it be concluded that the problems are definable?

Statement of the Problem

This problem was designed as a study of the positive attitudes of music catalogers toward major music score and phonodisc cataloging problems. The study was aimed at obtaining meaningful information concerning three major questions:

1. What were the positive attitudes of the above designated music catalogers toward the existence of music score and phonodisc cataloging problems?

2. What were the positive attitudes of the above designated music catalogers toward ranking the various cataloging problems of music scores and phonodiscs as to their significance?

3. How did the responses of the above designated music catalogers vary according to the group's years of experience, the group's types of degrees held or the group's combined library holdings of music scores and phonodiscs?

Definition of Terms

Positive Attitude

The viewpoint expressed by the music cataloger that indicated a major music score or phonodisc problem exists.

Major Problem

The point in question which the music cataloger

considered to be a vital concern to all who catalog music scores and phonodiscs. In the analysis of the data the major problem was established by the .05 level of significance.

Music Cataloging

The term which signified both classification and descriptive cataloging of music scores and phonodiscs.

Music Scores

All printed music, full or condensed, bound or unbound. Books with printed music were termed scores, if the music could be used for performance.

Phonodiscs

All recordings which were produced on a disc, such as the long-playing record. Tapes were excluded because they were harder to define.

Combined Holdings

An approximate estimate of all music scores and phonodiscs currently cataloged in a certain library.

Delimitation

This research was limited to a random sampling of music catalogers whose institution, school or library, was accredited with the National Association of Schools of Music. This association was the most authoritative group from which to select music catalogers. The sampling excluded schools or libraries in foreign countries.

Only music catalogers who were involved directly with the cataloging of music scores or phonodiscs were used in the

study.

The terminology used in this study was general in nature. The music cataloging problems discussed were treated as general categories rather than as specific details. However, in the literature search, chapter two, it was necessary to cite some specific incidents of cataloging music scores and phonodiscs.

Hypotheses

From the descriptions and definitions stated previously, the following hypotheses were derived and tested at the .05 level of significance:

1. No significant difference will be found among the responses of the music catalogers to indicate that major problems of cataloging music scores and phonodiscs do exist.

2. No significant difference will be found among the responses of the music catalogers to indicate that the problems cited in the survey can be classified as to difficulty.

3. No significant difference will be found between the attitudes of music catalogers with five or less years of experience and of music catalogers with more than five years of experience.

4. No significant difference will be found between the attitudes of music catalogers having bachelor's degrees or less and of music catalogers having master's degrees or higher.

5. No significant difference will be found relative to responses made between music catalogers' years of experience and music catalogers' degrees held.

6. No significant difference will be found relative to responses made between music catalogers' years of experience and music catalogers' combined holdings of music scores and phonodiscs.

7. No significant difference will be found relative to responses made between music catalogers' degrees held and music catalogers' combined holdings of music scores and phonodiscs.

8. No significant interaction will occur among the music catalogers' years of experience, the music catalogers' degrees held, nor the music catalogers' two contrasts concerning combined holdings of music scores and phonodiscs.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE SEARCH

In order to clarify issues stated in the problem section of chapter one, a review of available literature pertaining to statements about music score and phonodisc cataloging problems was conducted. The review consisted of selected statements of music score and phonodisc cataloging problems published by American librarians. The statements were selected on the basis of defining existing problems and not on the basis of offering possible solutions to problems.

Because the literature about music score and phonodisc cataloging problems was relatively new, the investigation of this review was limited in scope. A large number of citations were not used as they did not directly mention the problems involved.

In the writer's judgment the discussion of music score and phonodisc cataloging problem statements fell into three general periods of time: (1) prior to World War II, (2) during the 1950s, and (3) during this past decade.

Statements Prior to World War II

At the beginning of this present century the biggest concern of American music catalogers was the difficulty they had in identifying music scores. The examples offered in the

cataloging codes were extremely difficult to interpret. The music catalogers had to rely on their own judgments in order to catalog the music scores properly.

One of the first articles published about the subject occurred in 1915. Otto Kinkeldey of the New York Public Library, in speaking about American music catalogs, referred to the music score catalog of Oscar G. Sonneck.[1] Sonneck headed the music division of the Library of Congress and established many guidelines for music score cataloging. However, when he finished his timely music catalog, he discovered three basic reoccurring catalog problems. The problems consisted of how to separate entries by a composer from those about him, how to arrange various music works, and how to connect entries of a single opera.

After 1915 there were three prominent librarians who published important statements pertaining to music score cataloging. Ruth Wallace, librarian at Indianapolis Public Library (1927), compiled the first book to deal exclusively with music score problems.[2] The book resulted from a questionnaire sent out to some thirty libraries under the auspices of the American Library Association. In her book she stated that a decision had to be made concerning whether to segregate or mingle music score cards with other music

---

[1] Otto Kinkeldey, "American Music Catalogs," Library Journal 40 (August 1915): 577.

[2] Ruth Wallace, Care and Treatment of Music in a Library (Chicago: American Library Association, 1927), p. 32.

book cards. Harriet MacPherson (1936) of the Columbia University Library School drew attention to the fact that the adoption of a uniform title entry was more serious than additional headings.[1] And James C. M. Hanson (1939), a prominent cataloger at the Library of Congress, reported the problem of music works containing texts.[2] The texts needed to be identified as well as the music.

Statements During the 1950s

After World War II statements about music score cataloging problems began to include those of phonodiscs. Music librarians were becoming more aware of their close relationship in cataloging. Three important problem statements about music score and phonodisc cataloging appeared in the literature during this middle period.

Virginia Cunningham (1950), head of the cataloging department at the Library of Congress, referred to the constant change factor which occurs in cataloging music scores and also in cataloging phonodiscs.

> Music is one of the most enjoyable materials to catalog, but it presents peculiar difficulties. It has its own language, musical notation, which the cataloger should know in order to work intelligently. In no other material is there such constant rearranging, re-editing and re-publishing of the same works, often

---

[1]Harriet MacPherson, Practical Problems in Cataloging (Chicago: American Library Association, 1936), p. 110.

[2]James C. M. Hanson, A Comparative Study of Cataloging Rules Based on the Anglo-American Code of 1908 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 7.

in forms far removed from the original ...[1]

Music librarian at the University of California at Berkeley, Vincent Duckles (1955), wrote the first important article to treat music scores and phonodiscs by name.[2] After briefly summarizing the history of cataloging these two media he presented three major cataloging problems involving music scores and phonodiscs. These problems included: (1) use of detailed notes and assignment of filing titles, (2) lack of music reference tools, and (3) lack of self-contained music catalogs as found in music schools and conservatories.

An important librarian to give definition to catalog problems of music scores and phonodiscs was Minnie Elmer (1959). Elmer, also from the University of California at Berkeley, had obtained a master's degree from the Columbia University with music cataloging being her speciality. While discussing the music catalog as a reference tool, she said:

> Any new material, initially a small specialized collection, tends to be treated in great detail, but as the body of material grows, the cost of such cataloging becomes prohibitive, and the need of it less apparent. This process can be witnessed in Library of Congress cataloging of both scores and records. An early Library of Congress card for a collection of scores is far more detailed, in both contents, notes and analytical entries, than a revision of the same card printed in 1960. The change in cataloging rules

---

[1]Virginia Cunningham, "Simplified Cataloging of Music," Journal of Cataloging and Classification 6 (Winter 1950): 6.

[2]Vincent H. Duckles, "Musical Scores and Recordings," Library Trends 4 (October 1955): 166-167.

is also a change in attitude toward the material itself.[1]

Statements During This Past Decade

Published statements about music score and phonodisc cataloging problems varied greatly between the 1960s and 1970s. The writer felt that this diversity was evidence that music catalogers wanted to define their problems as well as solve them. It was also a period when phonodisc cataloging problems were mentioned often.

One of the finest attempts at defining phonodisc classification problems occurred at the beginning of the decade. Gordon Stevenson (1963), a Kansas City Public Library music librarian, surveyed 392 phonodisc libraries. He sought a scientific approach to the problem of classification schemes and how music catalogers approached that scheme in their phonodisc collections. Stevenson concluded:

> One is tempted to call the total picture chaotic. but the illusion of total confusion is created more by differences in notational systems than by a multiplicity of basic approaches to the problem.[2]

Another discussion of phonodiscs was presented by Sherman Anderson (1965), phonodisc cataloger at the Detroit Public Library.[3] He mentioned the problem of subject content

---

[1]Minnie Elmer, "The Music Catalog as a Reference Tool," Library Trends 8 (July 1959): 532.

[2]Gordon Stevenson, "Classification Chaos," Library Journal 88 (15 October 1963): 3791.

[3]Sherman Anderson, "Cataloging the Contents of Certain Recordings," Library Resources and Technical Services 9 (Summer 1965): 359.

in entry cards for phonodiscs. Esther Piercy (1965), an Enoch Pratt Free Library cataloger, also commented about the cataloging details of phonodiscs and their arrangements.[1] She felt that all decisions should be determined by who uses the phonodiscs.

James B. Coover (1969) brought up an entirely different problem when he discussed problems of computerizing music score and phonodisc cataloging.[2] Coover, a past president of Music Library Association, evaluated the program of expanding music score and phonodisc catalogs at the State University of New York at Buffalo. He discouraged the use of computers to gather music score and phonodisc data for short-form catalogs, because the computers would delete important information. Among the items which would be deleted were the following: "(1) names of authors of song texts (2) publishers' plate numbers (3) listings of performers on recordings, and (4) notes about special features of books such as the presence of thematic catalogues."[3]

Coover remarked that computer programs had a long ways to go before they could gather information as well as competent music catalogers. Referring to a fine Vassar College phonodisc catalog now at the State University of New York at Buffalo, he reported:

---

[1]Esther J. Piercy, Commonsense Cataloging (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1965), p. 108.

[2]James B. Coover, "Computers, Catalogues, and Co-operation," Notes 25 (March 1969): 441.

[3]Ibid.

> The quality of that cataloguing is exceptional. For almost every recording, cataloguing was done by actual audition with score in hand, and the call number of that score was put customarily on the record catalogue card. In the case of works whose scores were difficult to locate, for those appearing in Denkmaler or in appendices to literary studies, for example, even the precise page number was added to the call number on the record card. In many instances, variants among several performances of the same work, and their corresponding scores, were noted. Such is the excellence of retrospective cataloguing which SUNYAB may not be equipped to generate in the future. Such is the quality of cataloguing which the computerization of catalogues probably will, or ought to, demand.[1]

In 1972 Jay Daily thought that the problems of music catalogers and their choices of subject headings were difficult enough to rationalize.

> The question arises whether an entry should be made by form, then by medium, or vice versa. The one is as good as the other. If the titles are by form, then the subject heading is automatically preferable by medium. This rationalizes the problems of the subject catalogers who may be called upon to make decisions that have baffled musiciologists.[2]

Last January (1974) the Music Library Association at its Mid-winter convention proposed that the problem of analytics for phonodiscs be solved by the Library of Congress or some other central group.

> A strong desire and need for analytics from the Library of Congress or some other central source was expressed and unanimous support for such a program was given by the members since time and money saved by individual libraries that now make their own analytics would be substantial.[3]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Jay Daily, Organizing Nonprint Materials: a Guide for Librarians (New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1972), p. 37.

[3] Music Library Association, "Midwinter Meeting," Library of Congress Information Bulletin 33 (10 May 1974): A-88.

The Association also recommended that a sub-committee be organized to examine "the problem of formulating adequate filing rules for card catalogs in music and record libraries."[1]

Summary of Statements

The review of available literature pertaining to music score and phonodisc cataloging problem statements by prominent librarians was divided into three periods of time. During the first period the statements referred mostly to music score cataloging problems, such as composer entries, arrangements of works, positions within catalogs and music works with texts. During the middle period (1950s) both music scores and phonodiscs received equal coverage, the problems being associated with duplications, detailed notes, filing titles, self-contained catalogs and changes in cataloging rules. The recent period of the last decade revealed statements concerned mostly with phonodisc cataloging problems and future data gathering by computers.

The literature thus presented has indicated, in the opinion of the writer, that the problems of music score and phonodisc cataloging have received clearer definition through the years. However, the future problems of cataloging music scores and phonodiscs demand even further definition.

---

[1]Ibid., p. A-89.

CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION

To obtain meaningful information concerning the major questions of this study, it was necessary to consult with music catalogers who handled music scores and phonodiscs. It was found that most of the libraries surveyed employed just one cataloger to do both music scores and phonodiscs. After they were cataloged, the music scores and phonodiscs were placed either in a single collection or into two distinct collections. These collections then were under the supervision of other music librarians. Thus it became necessary to locate and obtain information only from the music cataloger who dealt with the music scores and phonodiscs.

Survey Plan

In order to obtain the needed information which would indicate positive and/or negative responses of the music catalogers, it was necessary to use a written questionnaire. The sample survey plan, as defined by William Wiersma[1], was the design used for this study. This design was necessary in order to establish the attitudes of music

[1]William Wiersma, Research Methods in Education: An Introduction (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1969), p.272.

catalogers toward music score and phonodisc cataloging problems.

The survey for this study was entitled "Major Problems of Cataloging Music Scores and Phonodiscs". The writer compiled the survey using several resources. The literature related to music score and phonodisc cataloging was an important resource from which to gather general categories which respresented the various cataloging problems. Another important resource was consultation with Gerald Dick, an experienced music score and phonodisc cataloger at a university with a large collection of both media. Both of these resources aided greatly in the creation of the survey used in this study.

The survey instrument spelled out eighteen specific items. At the first of the survey the music cataloger's years of experience and college degrees were to be indicated. Also, the combined music score and phonodisc holdings of the music cataloger's library were to be specified. Then for the rest of the survey, the music cataloger evaluated fifteen various music cataloging problem statements as to their degree of difficulty. The survey indicated five various degrees as a means of evaluation; for example, (1) no problem (2) slight problem (3) somewhat a problem (4) a definite problem and (5) a major problem.

Collection Techniques

The population of music score and phonodisc catalogers was carefully selected. They were chosen from American

universities and colleges which had extensive music score and phonodisc collections. The writer chose as the authoritative group music catalogers affiliated with the National Association of Schools of Music. The music catalogers in this Association were also members of the Music Library Association.

The sampling of the music catalogers was done on a random basis, using the first three columns of a random units table. One hundred and fifty random numbers were selected to be applied to a list of universities and colleges affiliated with the National Association of Schools of Music. Those numbers were selected from the statistic tables edited by Beyer.[1] The random numbers were then applied to a current listing of universities and colleges associated with the National Association of Schools of Music, as found in the American Universities and Colleges directory.[2] Only one hundred and fifty of the possible three hundred and sixty-seven schools were chosen. The questionnaire was sent to the music cataloger of music scores and phonodiscs of these above mentioned schools.

Four people at the Brigham Young University evaluated and pretested the survey in as much as completion time for the study was limited. These persons were Leland Hendrix,

---

[1]William H. Beyer, ed., Handbook of Tables for Probability and Statistics 2nd Ed. (Cleveland, Ohio: The Chemical Rubber Co., 1968), p. 480.

[2]W. Todd Furniss, American Universities and Colleges 11th Ed. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973), pp. 70-73.

Professor of Statistics; Gerald Dick, music score and phonodisc cataloger; Beth Webb, music reference librarian; and Nathan M. Smith, the writer's chairman.

Analysis of Returns

The survey was sent to the 150 qualified music catalogers on July 9, 1974, and concluded three weeks later, on July 30, 1974. An ample return of 100 usuable surveys was received, which made the data adequate for testing. Three survey forms were returned unsigned and seventeen others arrived too late for the study. Investigation of the responses in the late surveys revealed similar attitudes as compared to those tested in the study.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Preparation

The instrumentation used for measurement of the information in this study was the Major Problems of Cataloging Music Scores and Phonodiscs Survey (see appendix 1).

The study's experimental design was based upon the use of inferential statistics derived from the sample survey. The design was used to designate positive, neutral or negative attitudes of music catalogers toward fifteen general categories of music score and phonodisc cataloging problems. In the study any sign of a music cataloger's positive attitude would indicate that he felt a major problem existed in cataloging music scores and phonodiscs.

The median score of 3.500 was used in the study to represent the neutral attitude level of those responding. The median score was derived from the five degrees of the rating scale used by the music catalogers in the survey. Scores higher than the median score represented positive attitudes toward the existence of major cataloging problems related to music scores and phonodiscs. Scores lower than the median score represented negative attitudes.

The data was measured by use of the Modified Amplified

Doolittle (M.A.D.) Program, a computer instrument developed by the Statistics Department at the Brigham Young University under the direction of Dr. Melvin Carter.

The three independent variables tested for analysis of variance were presented with their corresponding symbols as follows: (1) the symbol Y = the music catalogers' years of experience, (2) the symbol D = the music catalogers' bachelor's degrees or less and the music catalogers' master's degrees or more, and (3) the symbol H = the holdings of both music scores and phonodiscs used by the cataloger. Along with the three independent variables, fifteen dependent variables representing the various problem statements were tested.

The model used for the measurement of the data was $Y(IJK) = Y(I) + D(J)+H(K)+YD(IJ)+YH(IK)+DH(JK)+YDH(IJK)+E.$ The subscripts were the symbol I (1=under five years experience, 2=over five years experience); the symbol J (1=bachelor's degree or less, 2=master's degree or more); and the symbol K (1=under 10,000 music scores and phonodiscs, 2=between 10,000 and 20,000, and 3==over 20,000). The error factor was represented by the symbol E.

Interactions of the independent variables Y D and H were shown in four relationships: (1) by holding Y constant and varying D to form the interaction YD, (2) by holding Y constant and varying H to form YH, (3) by holding D constant and varying H to form DH, and (4) by holding H constant and varying YD to form YDH.

"Cell Sizes and Means" tables and "Analysis of Variance" tables were placed in appendix 2. The Tables were divided into two groups. The first five tables measured the number of responses for each question (cell size) and the average rating by the group for each question (mean score). The cell size was placed in the fourth of eight columns, left to right, as indicated on the table. The mean scores for three different categories of cataloging problems of music scores and phonodiscs were placed in the sixth, seventh and eighth columns. Tables 6 to 20 show statistically how the music catalogers' years of experience, their college degrees held, and their size of collections varied with each problem statement that was rated. The seventh column indicated if the factor, such as years experience, was significant at the .05 level or not. NS was the symbol used to indicate no significance. Columns three, four, five and six were the statistical figures which arrived at the significance or no significance answer.

The problem statements were obtained by selecting definite statements of music score and phonodisc cataloging problems from the library literature. The problem statements found in the Tables are listed by number, therefore, a brief explanation is given:

Number of Problem on Table	Full Statement Rated
Problem Number 1	You are constantly checking to see if a phonodisc is a duplicate.
Problem Number 2	Your call numbers or locational symbols create problems for patrons at times.

Problem Number 3	Variance in the physical size of scores and phonodiscs is a problem
Problem Number 4	The National Union Catalog lacks standard examples of descriptive cataloging for some items.
Problem Number 5	The creation of subject headings can be difficult at times.
Problem Number 6	Searching for uniform title entries can be time consuming.
Problem Number 7	Title and subject entries for musical excerpts, various mediums, or forms can be troublesome.
Problem Number 8	You might question LC's cutting off point for analytics on each title within an anthology.
Problem Number 9	You wish at times that you had better command of foreign languages to make proper judgments.
Problem Number 10	You consult the shelf list too frequently.
Problem Number 11	You have to search through several bibliographical tools before some uniform title entries can be verified.
Problem Number 12	The physical arrangement or proximity of music scores to phonodiscs can be a problem.
Problem Number 13	You have to decide whether to place title entry cards in the main catalog and/or single classed score-disc catalog.
Problem Number 14	Interrelationships with the faculty members can be a challenge at times.
Problem Number 15	You have to decide how to expand your card and/or book catalogs during the next decade.

The above fifteen problem statements represented the dependent variables of the study. They were the items which the music score and phonodisc catalogers rated with one of the five degrees of defining a problem as cited on page fourteen.

The .05 level of significance was used in this study for the evaluation of variances among years experience, degrees held and combined holdings of music scores and phonodiscs.

Data Results

Mean Responses Analyzed

The mean scores of the several types of responses fell within the designated median level of 3.500 as defined in the study. Within three problem statements there were responses which revealed positive attitudes on the part of the music catalogers. The three statements were Problem Number 5 (Subject Headings), Problem Number 6 (Uniform Title Entries), and Problem Number 8 (Analytics).

Problem Number 8 (see Table 3, column 7-Analytics) revealed the highest mean score of the study at 4.500 and three other scores above the 3.5 level. The 4.500 score occurred in the interaction between YDH and the ratings of music catalogers with five or less years of experience, with bachelor's degrees or less, and with their holdings 10,000 and over. The mean score of 4.375 occurred in the interaction between DH and the ratings of music catalogers with bachelor's degrees and with their holdings 10,000 and over. The mean

score of 4.250 appeared when an interaction occurred between YDH and the ratings of music catalogers with over five years experience, with bachelor's degree or less, and with their holdings 10,000 and over. The mean score of 3.956 occurred in an interaction between YH and the ratings of music catalogers with five or under years experience and with their holdings 10,000 and over. The mean score of 3.581 occurred with the ratings of music catalogers having holdings 10,000 and over.

Problem Number 6 (Uniform Title Entries-see Table 2, column 8) ranked beneath "analytics" with five important mean scores. The highest mean score in this section was rated at 3.765. That score occurred in an interaction between YDH and the ratings of music catalogers with five or under years experience, with master's degrees or more, and with their holdings 10,000 and over. The mean score of 3.708 occurred in the interaction YDH and the ratings of music catalogers with over five years experience, with master's degrees or more, and with their holdings under 10,000. The mean score of 3.632 occurred in an interaction between YH and the ratings of music catalogers with five or under years experience and with their holdings 10,000 and over. The mean score of 3.544 occurred in an interaction between DH and the ratings of the music catalogers with master's degrees or more and with their holdings 10,000 and over. And the lowest mean score of 3.515 which was above the median level occurred in an interaction between YD and the ratings of music

catalogers with over five years experience and with a master's degree or more.

Problem Number 5 (Subject Headings-see Table 2, column 7) had only one mean score which was above the median level. That one mean score was 3.625. The mean score occurred in an interaction between DH and the ratings of music catalogers with bachelor's degrees or less and with their holdings 10,000 and over.

Significant Variances

The Analysis of Variance Tables in appendix 2 revealed that there were four instances when the ratings of the music score and phonodisc catalogers were beneath the .05 level of significance.

The most important significance of the entire study occurred at the .0003 level which related to the problem of analytics (see Table 13). Music catalogers with holdings 10,000 or over considered analytics a definite problem rating it with a high mean score of 3.581. Music catalogers with holdings under 10,000 rated analytics with a low mean score of 1.968.

The next most important significance after that of analytics occurred with the problem of future expansion of catalogs(see Table 20). The interaction between music catalogers' years of experience and music catalogers' holdings relative to the problem of future expansion had a variance of .0087. The ratings of the music catalogers with holdings under 10,000 and five or under years of experience

had a low mean score of 1.190. The music catalogers with over five years experience and holdings 10,000 and over rated the problem of future expansion with a high mean score of 3.000.

The problem of creating subject headings received two ratings which were also beneath the .05 level of significance. These two instances were recorded in Table 10. The first instance had to do with degrees held. Music catalogers with bachelor's degrees or less rated the subject heading problem statement with a high mean score of 3.246, whereas music catalogers with master's degrees or more rated the same problem with a low mean of 2.517. The variance between those with bachelor's degrees or less and those with master's degrees or more was .0439. The second instance had to do with years experience and holdings. In the interaction between years experience and holdings relative to the problem of subject headings the variance was .0478. The low mean score was 2.310 for ratings by music catalogers with five or under years experience and holdings under 10,000 and over.

The four instances of significance as recorded in the Tables indicated that the problem statements about analytics, future expansion of catalogs, and subject headings showed the greatest variances in this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Problem Statement

This study was an investigation into the attitudes of music catalogers toward major problems of cataloging music scores and phonodiscs. Once delimitations were set upon the terminology, the study sought to answer three major questions (1) What were the positive attitudes of music catalogers toward the existence of cataloging problems for music scores and phonodiscs? (2) What were their positive attitudes towards rating the major problems, if they exist? and (3) How did their responses vary according to their years of experience, according to the college degrees they held, and according to the combined number of music score and phonodisc holdings their libraries had?

Procedures

A survey was sent to a random sample of music catalogers who processed music scores and/or phonodiscs. The 150 music catalogers were chosen from 367 universities and colleges affiliated with the National Association of Schools of Music. One hundred usable surveys were returned from most parts of the United States of America.

The survey was measured by the Modified Amplified

Doolittle Program (also called the M.A.D. Program). The research design obtained inferential statistics by using the Analysis of Variance Test for significance.

Summary of Findings

1. Hypothesis 1: Significant difference exists at the .05 level among the responses of the music catalogers to indicate that major problems of cataloging music scores and phonodiscs do exist. There was one case where the variance of holdings relative to L.C.'s analytics problems was significant. Music catalogers with collections 10,000 and over rated analytics high. This might be an indication that as collections become larger, they themselves (the collections) become the difficulty.

2. Hypothesis 2: Significant difference exists at the .05 level among the responses of the music catalogers to indicate that the problems cited in the survey can be classified as to difficulty. The single exception that makes this hypothesis significant was also the variance of holdings involving the problem of L.C.'s cutting-off point of analytics. (Subject headings, expansion of catalogs and uniform title entries rated above the median level of 3.500 but were not significant in variance.)

3. Hypothesis 3: No significant difference exists at the .05 level between the attitudes of the music catalogers with five or less years of experience and the attitudes of music catalogers with more than five years of experience.

This hypothesis was not rejected.

4. Hypothesis 4: Significant difference exists at the .05 level between the attitudes of music catalogers having bachelor's degrees or less and of music catalogers having master's degrees or higher. This hypothesis was rejected because music catalogers with bachelor's degrees and large collections rated subject heading problems high.

5. Hypothesis 5: No significant difference exists at the .05 level relative to responses made between music catalogers' years of experience and music catalogers' degrees held. This hypothesis was not rejected.

6. Hypothesis 6: Significant difference exists relative to responses made between music catalogers' years of experience and music catalogers' combined holdings of music scores and phonodiscs. Holdings relative to L.C.'s analytics problems was the greatest variance in the study. Music catalogers with large collections and less years of experience rated analytics, subject headings, and expansion of catalogs high. This hypothesis was rejected.

7. Hypothesis 7: No significant difference exists relative to responses made between music catalogers' degrees held and music catalogers' combined holdings of music scores and phonodiscs. This hypothesis was not rejected.

8. Hypothesis 8: No significant interaction occurs among the music catalogers' years of experience, the music catalogers' degrees held, nor the music catalogers' two contrasts concerning combined holdings of music scores and

phonodiscs. This hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusions

An analysis of this study revealed the following conclusions:

1. The responses of the music catalogers indicated that in some cases they did have positive attitudes toward the existence of some major cataloging problems pertaining to music scores and phonodiscs. These specific cases which they considered as major categorical problem areas included problems of defining details for analytics of music anthologies, future development of card and/or book catalogs by way of expansion problems, and problems dealing with the creation of subject headings on catalog cards.

2. The responses of the music catalogers also indicated that problems dealing with analytics of anthologies, with establishing uniform title entries and with creating subject headings rated the highest.

3. There was some significant indication that the factors of years experience, of degrees held, or of music holdings consisting of music scores and phonodiscs varied significantly in some cases. Most noteworthy were music catalogers with bachelor's degrees or less who responded more positive than music catalogers with master's degrees or more, and the responses of music catalogers who had large holdings of music scores and phonodiscs.

4. The literature search revealed that through the years discussions in articles about music score and

phonodisc cataloging problems have focused in greater detail on such problems existing. In the past writers sought only to give their procedures or answers to the problems without clearly defining them. In recent years the writers are seeking clearer definitions before going on to the solution of the problems involved.

The investigation of the varied problems of cataloging music scores and phonodiscs (as listed in the Response Chart in appendix 3) and their possible solution will greatly aid future catalogers, as well as those now serving the music library and its needs all across our country.

APPENDIX 1

MAJOR PROBLEMS OF CATALOGING MUSIC SCORES AND PHONODISCS SURVEY

Survey

MAJOR PROBLEMS OF CATALOGING MUSIC SCORES

AND PHONODISCS

Kindly place number answers upon the blank lines. A check mark can be used for questions 1 - 3. Since you are qualified (knowing about problems of cataloging music scores and phonodiscs), you are unrestricted in answering the questions. Your additional answers or comments at the end of the survey would be appreciated.

YOUR BACKGROUND

(1) Years as cataloger: Five or under ___, Over Five ____.

(2) Degrees you hold: Bachelor's or less ___,
Master's or more ____.

(3) Your approx. combined holdings of music scores and phonodiscs: Under 10,000 ___, Between 10,000 and 20,000 ___, More than 20,000 ____.

PROBLEM AREAS OF MUSIC SCORE AND

PHONODISC CATALOGING

Which of the following statements represent major cataloging problems? Please rate them according to the scale below:

1 - not a problem
2 - slight problem
3 - somewhat a problem
4 - a definite problem
5 - a major problem

____ (6) You are constantly checking to see if a phonodisc is a duplicate.

____ (7) Your call numbers or locational symbols create problems for patrons at times.

____ (8) Variance in the physical size of scores and phonodiscs is a problem.

____ (9) The Union Catalog lacks standard examples of descriptive cataloging for some items.

____(10) The creation of subject headings can be difficult at times.

____(11) Searching for uniform title entries can be time consuming.

____(12) Title and subject entries for musical excerpts, various mediums or forms can be troublesome.

____(13) You might question LC's cutting off point for analytics on each title within an anthology.

____(14) You wish at times that you had better command of foreign languages to make proper judgments.

____(15) You consult the shelf list too frequently.

____(16) You have to search through several bibliographical tools before some title entries can be verified.

____(17) The physical arrangement or proximity of music scores to phonodiscs can be a problem.

____(18) You have to decide whether to place title entry cards in the main catalog and/or single classed score-disc catalog or not.

____(19) Interrelationships with faculty members can be a challenge at times.

____(20) You have to decide how to expand your card and/or book catalogs during the next decade.

If you desire a summary of this study write in your name and institution.

_____

Your time on this survey is appreciated. We can be grateful for our few cataloging problems, because they make the work interesting.

Please feel free to use the rest of the paper for comments:

APPENDIX 2

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES 1-20

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1

CELL SIZES AND MEANS ASSOCIATED WITH THE
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBERS 1-3

SOURCE		LEVEL		SIZE	DUPLICAT	SYMBOLS	SIZE
YEARS	(Y)	5 OR LESS	(1)	36	1.446	1.985	1.650
		OVER 5	(2)	64	1.669	1.816	2.136
DEGREES	(D)	BACHELOR	(B)	14	1.438	1.904	1.792
		MASTER	(M)	86	1.678	1.897	1.994
HOLDINGS	(H)	UNDER 10000	(3)	46	1.259	1.656	2.071
		10000-OVER	(4)	54	1.857	2.146	1.714
YD		1B		5	1.250	2.083	1.333
		1M		31	1.643	1.887	1.966
		2B		9	1.625	1.725	2.250
		2M		55	1.714	1.908	2.021
YH		13		17	1.143	1.650	1.976
		14		19	1.750	2.279	1.324
		23		29	1.375	1.621	2.167
		24		35	1.964	2.012	2.105
DH		B3		8	1.000	1.433	1.833
		B4		6	1.875	2.375	1.750
		M3		38	1.518	1.878	2.310
		M4		48	1.839	1.917	1.678
YDH		1B3		3	1.000	1.667	1.667
		1B4		2	1.500	2.500	1.000
		1M3		14	1.286	1.714	2.286
		1M4		17	2.000	2.059	1.647
		2B3		5	1.000	1.200	2.000
		2B4		4	2.250	2.250	2.500
		2M3		24	1.750	2.042	2.333
		2M4		31	1.677	1.774	1.710

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2

CELL SIZES AND MEANS ASSOCIATED WITH THE
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBERS 4-6

SOURCE		LEVEL		SIZE	CATALOG	HEADINGS	ENTRIES
YEARS	(Y)	5 OR LESS	(1)	36	2.079	2.846	3.334
		OVER 5	(2)	64	2.634	2.917	3.095
DEGREES	(D)	BACHELOR	(B)	14	2.217	3.246	2.962
		MASTER	(M)	86	2.497	2.517	3.467
HOLDINGS	(H)	UNDER 10000	(3)	46	2.285	2.703	3.095
		10000-OVER	(4)	54	2.428	3.060	3.334
YD		1B		5	1.833	3.167	3.250
		1M		31	2.326	2.525	3.418
		2B		9	2.600	3.325	2.675
		2M		55	2.668	2.509	3.515
YH		13		17	2.012	2.310	3.036
		14		19	2.147	3.382	3.632
		23		29	2.558	3.096	3.154
		24		35	2.710	2.738	3.036
DH		B3		8	1.933	2.867	2.800
		B4		6	2.500	3.625	3.125
		M3		38	2.637	2.539	3.390
		M4		48	2.357	2.495	3.544
YDH		1B3		3	1.667	2.333	3.000
		1B4		2	2.000	4.000	3.500
		1M3		14	2.357	2.286	3.071
		1M4		17	2.294	2.765	3.765
		2B3		5	2.200	3.400	2.600
		2B4		4	3.000	3.250	2.750
		2M3		24	2.917	2.792	3.708
		2M4		31	2.419	2.226	3.323

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3

CELL SIZES AND MEANS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON PROBLEM NUMBERS 7-9

SOURCE		LEVEL		SIZE	EXCERPTS	ANALYTIC	LANGUAGE
YEARS	(Y)	5 OR LESS	(1)	36	2.557	2.948	2.376
		OVER 5	(2)	64	2.570	2.601	2.021
DEGREES	(D)	BACHELOR	(B)	14	2.487	3.154	2.063
		MASTER	(M)	86	2.639	2.395	2.334
HOLDINGS	(H)	UNDER 10000	(3)	46	2.559	1.968	2.173
		10000-OVER	(4)	54	2.568	3.581	2.224
YD		1B		5	2.500	3.083	2.250
		1M		31	2.613	2.813	2.502
		2B		9	2.475	3.225	1.875
		2M		55	2.665	1.976	2.167
YH		13		17	2.643	1.940	2.179
		14		19	2.471	3.956	2.574
		23		29	2.475	1.996	2.167
		24		35	2.665	3.206	1.875
DH		B3		8	2.600	1.933	2.000
		B4		6	2.375	4.375	2.125
		M3		38	2.518	2.003	2.345
		M4		48	2.761	2.787	2.324
YDH		1B3		3	3.000	1.667	2.000
		1B4		2	2.000	4.500	2.500
		1M3		14	2.286	2.214	2.357
		1M4		17	2.941	3.412	2.647
		2B3		5	2.200	2.200	2.000
		2B4		4	2.750	4.250	1.750
		2M3		24	2.750	1.792	2.333
		2M4		31	2.581	2.161	2.000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4

CELL SIZES AND MEANS ASSOCIATED WITH THE
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBERS 10-12

SOURCE		LEVEL		SIZE	SHLF LST	TOOLS	ARRANGE
YEARS	(Y)	5 OR LESS	(1)	36	1.142	2.298	1.257
		OVER 5	(2)	64	1.223	2.591	1.505
DEGREES	(D)	BACHELOR	(B)	14	0.958	2.071	1.300
		MASTER	(M)	86	1.407	2.817	1.462
HOLDINGS	(H)	UNDER 10000	(3)	46	1.302	2.483	1.581
		10000-OVER	(4)	54	1.063	2.405	1.181
YD		1B		5	0.917	1.917	1.000
		1M		31	1.368	2.679	1.515
		2B		9	1.000	2.225	1.600
		2M		55	1.446	2.956	1.409
YH		13		17	1.417	2.345	1.250
		14		19	0.868	2.250	1.265
		23		29	1.188	2.621	1.912
		24		35	1.258	2.560	1.097
DH		B3		8	1.167	2.267	1.600
		B4		6	0.750	1.875	1.000
		M3		38	1.438	2.699	1.563
		M4		48	1.376	2.935	1.361
YDH		1B3		3	1.333	2.333	1.000
		1B4		2	0.500	1.500	1.000
		1M3		14	1.500	2.357	1.500
		1M4		17	1.235	3.000	1.529
		2B3		5	1.000	2.200	2.200
		2B4		4	1.000	2.250	1.000
		2M3		24	1.375	3.042	1.625
		2M4		31	1.516	2.871	1.194

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 5

CELL SIZES AND MEANS ASSOCIATED WITH THE
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBERS 13-15

SOURCE		LEVEL		SIZE	CATFACUL	TY EXPAN	D
YEARS	(Y)	5 OR LESS	(1)	36	0.943	1.843	2.095
		OVER 5	(2)	64	1.174	1.885	2.194
DEGREES	(D)	BACHELOR	(B)	14	0.962	1.987	2.017
		MASTER	(M)	86	1.155	1.741	2.272
HOLDINGS	(H)	UNDER 10000	(3)	46	1.266	1.934	1.789
		10000-OVER	(4)	54	0.851	1.794	2.500
YD		1B		5	0.750	2.000	1.833
		1M		31	1.137	1.687	2.357
		2B		9	1.175	1.975	2.200
		2M		55	1.173	1.794	2.188
YH		13		17	1.107	1.893	1.190
		14		19	0.779	1.794	3.000
		23		29	1.425	1.975	2.387
		24		35	0.923	1.794	2.000
DH		B3		8	1.300	2.100	1.533
		B4		6	0.625	1.875	2.500
		M3		38	1.232	1.768	2.045
		M4		48	1.078	1.713	2.500
YDH		1B3		3	1.000	2.000	0.667
		1B4		2	0.500	2.000	3.000
		1M3		14	1.214	1.786	1.714
		1M4		17	1.059	1.588	3.000
		2B3		5	1.600	2.200	2.400
		2B4		4	0.750	1.750	2.000
		2M3		24	1.250	1.750	2.375
		2M4		31	1.097	1.839	2.000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER ONE

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.535	0.535	0.505	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.624	0.624	0.589	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	3.846	3.846	3.633	NS
YD		1	0.249	0.249	0.235	NS
YH		1	0.001	0.001	0.001	NS
DH		1	0.826	0.826	0.780	NS
YDH		1	1.588	1.588	1.500	NS
ERROR		92	97.381	1.056		

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER TWO

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.305	0.305	0.347	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.001	0.001	0.001	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	2.584	2.584	2.938	NS
YD		1	0.388	0.388	0.441	NS
YH		1	0.105	0.105	0.120	NS
DH		1	2.193	2.193	2.495	NS
YDH		1	0.462	0.462	0.525	NS
ERROR		92	80.893	0.879		

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER THREE

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	2.539	2.539	1.691	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.440	0.440	0.293	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	1.373	1.373	0.914	NS
YD		1	1.996	1.996	1.329	NS
YH		1	0.939	0.939	0.625	NS
DH		1	0.807	0.807	0.538	NS
YDH		1	0.892	0.892	0.594	NS
ERROR		92	138.127	1.501		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER FOUR

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	3.307	3.307	2.423	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.844	0.844	0.618	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	0.221	0.221	0.162	NS
YD		1	0.484	0.484	0.355	NS
YH		1	0.001	0.001	0.001	NS
DH		1	1.928	1.928	1.413	NS
YDH		1	0.546	0.546	0.400	NS
ERROR		92	125.592	1.365		

TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER FIVE

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.054	0.054	0.040	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	5.714	5.714	4.175	0.0439
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	1.374	1.374	1.004	NS
YD		1	0.082	0.082	0.060	NS
YH		1	5.505	5.505	4.022	0.0478
DH		1	1.729	1.729	1.263	NS
YDH		1	0.400	0.400	0.293	NS
ERROR		92	125.910	1.369		

TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER SIX

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.613	0.613	0.563	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	2.735	2.735	2.512	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	0.616	0.616	0.566	NS
YD		1	1.216	1.216	1.117	NS
YH		1	1.373	1.373	1.261	NS
DH		1	0.079	0.079	0.072	NS
YDH		1	0.357	0.357	0.328	NS
ERROR		92	100.170	1.089		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER SEVEN

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.002	0.002	0.001	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.248	0.248	0.182	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	0.001	0.001	0.001	NS
YD		1	0.016	0.016	0.012	NS
YH		1	0.354	0.354	0.259	NS
DH		1	0.589	0.589	0.432	NS
YDH		1	3.791	3.791	2.782	NS
ERROR		92	125.397	1.363		

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER EIGHT

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	1.298	1.298	0.659	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	6.203	6.203	3.147	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	27.972	27.972	14.191	0.0003
YD		1	2.573	2.573	1.305	NS
YH		1	1.745	1.745	0.885	NS
DH		1	7.393	7.393	3.751	NS
YDH		1	0.001	0.001	0.001	NS
ERROR		92	181.343	1.971		

TABLE 14

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER NINE

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	1.357	1.357	1.333	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.795	0.795	0.781	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	0.029	0.029	0.028	NS
YD		1	0.004	0.004	0.004	NS
YH		1	1.268	1.268	1.245	NS
DH		1	0.058	0.058	0.057	NS
YDH		1	0.011	0.011	0.011	NS
ERROR		92	93.680	1.018		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 15

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER TEN

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.070	0.070	0.113	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	2.161	2.161	3.483	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	0.616	0.616	0.992	NS
YD		1	0.000	0.000	0.000	NS
YH		1	1.032	1.032	1.663	NS
DH		1	0.339	0.339	0.546	NS
YDH		1	0.123	0.123	0.198	NS
ERROR		92	57.092	0.621		

TABLE 16

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER ELEVEN

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.924	0.924	0.558	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	5.996	5.996	3.620	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	0.065	0.065	0.039	NS
YD		1	0.003	0.003	0.002	NS
YH		1	0.003	0.003	0.002	NS
DH		1	1.060	1.060	0.640	NS
YDH		1	1.936	1.936	1.169	NS
ERROR		92	152.373	1.656		

TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER TWELVE

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.658	0.658	0.492	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.282	0.282	0.211	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	1.725	1.725	1.291	NS
YD		1	1.338	1.338	1.001	NS
YH		1	1.854	1.854	1.387	NS
DH		1	0.428	0.428	0.320	NS
YDH		1	0.367	0.367	0.275	NS
ERROR		92	122.999	1.337		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER THIRTEEN

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.574	0.574	0.866	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.398	0.398	0.601	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	1.850	1.850	2.791	NS
YD		1	0.405	0.405	0.612	NS
YH		1	0.081	0.081	0.123	NS
DH		1	0.729	0.729	1.100	NS
YDH		1	0.083	0.083	0.126	NS
ERROR		92	60.958	0.663		

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER FOURTEEN

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.018	0.018	0.019	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.655	0.655	0.680	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	0.210	0.210	0.218	NS
YD		1	0.047	0.047	0.049	NS
YH		1	0.018	0.018	0.019	NS
DH		1	0.078	0.078	0.081	NS
YDH		1	0.364	0.364	0.378	NS
ERROR		92	88.718	0.964		

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
PROBLEM NUMBER FIFTEEN

SOURCE		DF	SS	MS	F	P
YEARS	(Y)	1	0.104	0.104	0.058	NS
DEGREES	(D)	1	0.703	0.703	0.389	NS
HOLDINGS	(H)	1	5.438	5.438	3.007	NS
YD		1	0.773	0.773	0.428	NS
YH		1	12.980	12.980	7.179	0.0087
DH		1	0.703	0.703	0.389	NS
YDH		1	0.773	0.773	0.428	NS
ERROR		92	166.349	1.808		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 3

RESPONSE CHART OF COMBINED RANKINGS ON THE FOURTH AND FIFTH DEGREES OF THE SURVEY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RESPONSE CHART OF COMBINED RANKINGS

ON THE FOURTH & FIFTH DEGREES OF THE SURVEY

Problem Number	Category Ranked	4th Degree*	5th Degree*	Total Responses
6	Uniform Title Entries	32	15	47
11	Use of Bibliographical Tools	16	12	28
8	LC Cut Off of Analytics	10	15	25
5	Subject Headings	18	7	25
15	Expansion Catalogs	12	9	21
4	National Union Catalog	16	4	20
7	Musical Excerpts	13	6	19
9	Foreign Language	13	2	15
3	Size of Score and Phonodiscs	9	4	13
1	Duplication of Phonodiscs	6	2	8
12	Arrangement of Scores to Catalogs	1	6	7
14	Faculty Relationships	4	1	5
2	Call Number Problems	3	1	4
13	Main or Divided Catalogs	4	0	4
10	Shelf List Too Frequent	2	1	3

* Fourth Degree = a definite problem

* Fifth Degree = a major problem

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SOURCES CITED

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SOURCES CITED

Books

Daily, Jay. Organizing Nonprint Materials: a Guide for Librarians. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1972.

Hanson, James C.M. A Comparative Study of Cataloging Rules Based on the Anglo-American Code of 1908. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

MacPherson, Harriet. Practical Problems in Cataloging. Chicago: American Library Association, 1936.

Piercy, Esther J. Commonsense Cataloging. New York: H.W.Wilson, 1965.

Wallace, Ruth. Care and Treatment of Music in a Library. Chicago: American Library Association, 1927.

Periodicals

Anderson, Sherman. "Cataloging the Contents of Certain Recordings." Library Resources and Technical Services 9 (Summer 1965):359-362.

Coover, James B. "Computers, Catalogues, and Co-operation." Notes 25 (March 1969): 437-446.

Cunningham, Virginia. "Simplified Cataloging of Music." Journal of Cataloging and Classification 6 (Winter 1950):6-7.

Duckles, Vincent H. "Musical Scores and Recordings." Library Trends 4 (October 1955): 164-173.

Elmer, Minnie. "The Music Catalog as a Reference Tool." Library Trends 8 (July 1959): 529-538.

Kinkeldey, Otto. "American Music Catalogs." Library Journal 40 (August 1915): 574-578.

Music Library Association. "Midwinter Meeting." Library of Congress Information Bulletin 33 (10 May 1974): A88-A89.

Stevenson, Gordon. "Classification Chaos." Library Journal 88 (15 October 1963): 3789-3794.